

### REMARKS

This responds to the Office Action mailed on April 29, 2005. Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

By this amendment, claims 15 – 18 and 20 are amended, no claims are canceled, and no claims are added; as a result, claims 1 – 28 remain pending in this application.

#### Submission of Formal Drawings

Applicant submits herewith three sheets of formal drawings. It is believed that the drawings are in compliance with 37 C.F.R. 1.84. No amendments have been made to the drawings.

#### §103 Rejection of the Claims

Claims 15 and 17 were rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Littlefield (U.S. 4,949,280).

Applicants' amended claim 15 is directed to a communication device that has an application processor and a coprocessor that communicate formatted command data and output data over a high-speed data path. As recited in amended claim 15, the formatted command data and the output data are in an output-data format. In other words, Applicants' high-speed data path of claim 15 is used to communicate **both command data and output data**. Furthermore, the command data that is communicated over Applicants' high-speed data path of claim 15 is formatted in an output data format.

Amended claim 17, for example, recites that the output-data format is a pixel-stream format and that the output data is image data. In other words, the command data is formatted in a pixel stream format for communication across the high-speed data path. In this way, image data and command data are communicated over the same data path.

Littlefield (U.S. 4,949,280), on the other hand, does not communicate both command data and output data over the same path. Littlefield communicates a graphics command stream which is processed into pixel data (see abstract, and see "graphics commands" and network 18 illustrated in Littlefield's FIG. 5).

Applicants find no teaching, suggestion or motivation in Littlefield that the graphics commands are in any way formatted in an output-data format. Applicants further submit that there is no reason for Littlefield to format graphic commands into an output format because no output data is communicated over the Littleton's network 18 along with the graphics commands (See Littlefield column 7, lines 19 – 33).

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 1-14 and 21-28 were allowed.

Claims 16 and 18-20 were objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but were indicated to be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Claims 16, 18 and 20 have rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims and are believed to be in condition for allowance. Claim 19 is believed to be in condition for allowance at least because of its dependency on now independent claim 18.

Conclusion

Applicant respectfully submits that the claims are in condition for allowance and notification to that effect is earnestly requested. The Examiner is invited to telephone Applicant's attorney, Greg Gorrie at (480) 659-3314, or Applicant's below-named representative to facilitate prosecution of this application.

If necessary, please charge any additional fees or credit overpayment to Deposit Account No. 19-0743.

Respectfully submitted,

LAWRENCE A. BOOTH, JR. ET AL.

By their Representatives,

SCHWEGMAN, LUNDBERG, WOESSNER & KLUTH, P.A.  
Attorneys for Intel Corporation  
P.O. Box 2938  
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402  
(612) 349-9592

Date June 29, 2005

By Ann M. McCrackin  
Ann M. McCrackin  
Reg. No. 42,858

CERTIFICATE UNDER 37 CFR 1.8: The undersigned hereby certifies that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail, in an envelope addressed to: MS Amendment, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, on this 29th day of June 2005

Anne M. Richards

\_\_\_\_\_  
Name

Anne M. Richards  
Signature